

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Masayuki Sakakura et al.	Art Unit :	2882
Serial No. :	10/098,617	Examiner :	Thomas R. Artman
Filed :	March 18, 2002	Conf. No. :	3682
Title :	LIGHT EMITTING APPARATUS AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING THE SAME		

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF DECEMBER 19, 2006

Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50 and 53-103 are currently pending with claims 2, 5, 53-58 and 89 being independent. Claims 53-88 have been withdrawn from consideration, leaving claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50 and 89-103 pending for prosecution with claims 2, 5 and 89 being independent.

Claims 2, 14, 35, 41, 47, 89, 90, 94-96 and 98-100 have been rejected as unpatentable over Yamada (US 6,246, 179 B1) in view of Miyauti (JP 11-31587). Applicant again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Yamada, Miyauti, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a second insulating layer formed on a first electrode and a first insulating layer, as recited in claim 2, or a layer comprising carbon formed on the first electrode and the first insulating layer, as recited in claim 89.

As set forth in applicant's prior response, the rejection recognizes that Yamada does not describe or suggest these features and relies on Miyauti as doing so. In particular, the rejection alleges that Miyauti specifically teaches the practice of depositing a thin insulation layer 3 between a first electrode 2 and an organic compound layer 4 and 5 in a light emitting device. However, Miyauti in no way indicates that the thin insulation layer 3 is a second insulating layer formed on a first insulating layer, as is recited in claim 2. Stated another way, Miyauti in no way describes or suggests placing the insulation layer 3 between a first insulating layer and the organic compound layer 4. Yamada also fails to describe or suggest placing an insulating layer between a first insulating layer and an organic compound layer. Accordingly, since both

Yamada and Miyauti fail to describe or suggest this feature, any proper combination of the two would also fail to do so, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In response to this argument, the Examiner asserts that it is inherent for the second insulating layer to be formed on the first insulating layer. Applicant strongly disagrees. Since neither Yamada nor Miyauti describes first and second insulating layers, it in no way can be inherent for either of the references, or any proper combination of the references, to include a second insulating layer on a first insulating layer.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner's contention that the significance of the invention lies in having the second insulating layer separating the organic compound layer and the first electrode. In particular, applicant notes that this is just one feature of claim 2 and that the invention of a particular claim is defined by the entire collection of features recited in the claim, not just a particular feature.

Claims 2, 8, 14, 35, 41, 47, 89, 94-96 and 98-100 have been rejected as unpatentable over Yamada in view of Nagayama (JP 11-224781). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above and because, as with Yamada and Miyauti, neither Yamada, Nagayama, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a second insulating layer formed on a first electrode and a first insulating layer, as recited in claim 2, or a layer comprising carbon formed on the first electrode and the first insulating layer, as recited in claim 89.

The rejection alleges that Nagayama specifically teaches the practice of depositing a thin insulation layer 109 between a first electrode 102 and an organic compound layer 103 in a light emitting device. However, Nagayama, like Miyauti, fails to describe or suggest that the insulation layer 109 is formed between a first insulating layer and an organic compound layer 103. Since Yamada also fails to disclose this feature, as previously noted, any proper combination of the two would also fail to do so and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 35, 38, 47, 50, 89, 90, 94 and 96-103 have been rejected as unpatentable over Urabe (US 6,614,174) in view of Miyauti. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above and because, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Urabe does not describe or suggest the use of a second insulation layer between a first electrode and an organic compound film, and, accordingly, does not describe or suggest a

second insulating layer formed on a first electrode and a first insulating layer, as recited in claim 2, or a layer comprising carbon formed on the first electrode and the first insulating layer, as recited in claim 89.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50, 89, 91 and 93-103 have been rejected as unpatentable over Urabe (US 6,614, 174 B1) in view of Nagayama. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the reasons discussed above.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$120 for the one-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/17/07


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
/adt
40408356.doc